

No. 13100-4Lab-72/49329.—In pursuance of the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Jai Denash Rolling Mills, Bahadurgarh.

BEFORE SHRI O.P. SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 175 of 1972

between

SHRI RAM SARUP AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S JAIDENASH ROLLING MILLS, BAHADURGARH

Present—

Shri Rajinder Singh Dahiya, for the workman.
Nemo, for the management.

AWARD

This reference under clause (c) of sub-section (i) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has arisen out of the following facts.

Shri Ram Sarup Paliwala concerned workman put in service with M/s Jai Denash Rolling Mills, Bahadurgarh at Rs 240 per mensem for a period of more than one year. The management terminated his services with effect from 28th March, 1972 without giving any notice or charge-sheet and without any justification. He raised a demand for his reinstatement but without any response from the management. This gave rise to an industrial dispute.

On receipt of the failure report from the Conciliation Officer, the Governor of Haryana has referred the above dispute to this Court for adjudication,—*vide* order No. ID/RK/239-A-72/20139-43, dated 2nd June, 1972, with the following term of reference:—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Sarup was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?”

Usual notices were given to the parties. The management has not cared to come forward and contest the claim of the workman inspite of service. He has filed his statement of claim re-iterating his demand for reinstatement and back wages earlier raised through the demand notice, dated 4th April, 1972 W.W.2/1, which forms part of the present reference.

Evidence of the workman has been recorded. He has made his own statement which finds support in the testimony of Shri Rajinder Singh Dahiya, President, Bahadurgarh Potteries and General Labour Union, Bahadurgarh.

From the facts brought on record I am satisfied that the management had terminated the services of this workman without any justification and he has since not been gainfully employed anywhere during the period of his forced unemployment, he is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages. He is also entitled to Rs 50 as costs of the present proceedings. The award is made accordingly.

O.P. SHARMA,

Dated 28th November, 1972.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 2693, dated 30th November, 1972.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

O.P. SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 13098-4Lab-72/49331.—In pursuance of the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Sunrise Products Ltd., Bahadurgarh.

BEFORE SHRI O. P. SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 15 of 1972.

Between

SHRI LACHHMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S SUNRISE PRODUCTS, LTD.,
BAHADURGARH

Present.—

Shri Rajinder Singh, for the applicant.

Shri R. L. Gupta, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/PN/25-C-71/250, dated 5th January, 1972, of the Governor of Haryana, the following dispute between the management of M/s Sunrise Products, Ltd., Bahadurgarh and its workman Shri Lachhman was referred for adjudication to this court in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Lachhman was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the order of reference usual notices were given to the parties. Their authorised representatives have appeared and made their statements. According to the plea raised on behalf of the management it is a case of abandonment of service by the workman concerned and as such no industrial dispute exists between the parties. The authorised representative of the workman has also stated that he has gone back to his native village and he is not interested in the present reference.

In view of the above a no dispute award is given as requested by the parties. No order as to cost.

Dated 27th November, 1972.

O. P. SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 2694, dated 30th November, 1972

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

O. P. SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No 13112-4Lab-72/49333.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Mechlic Industry, Delhi Road, Gurgaon.

BEFORE SHRI O.P. SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 144 of 1971

Between

SHRI KHOOBI RAM AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S MECHLIC INDUSTRY, DELHI ROAD,
GURGAON

Present.—

Shri Shardha Nand, for the workman.
Nemo, for the management.

AWARD

Shri Khoobi Ram was in the service of M/s Mechlic Industry, Delhi Road, Gurgaon, as a Helper at Rs 100 per mensem. The management terminated his service with effect from 17th April, 1971, allegedly without notice or charge-sheet. He raised demand for reinstatement but without any success. This gave rise to an industrial dispute.

On receipt of the failure report from the Conciliation Officer, Gurgaon, the Governor of Haryana in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, has referred the above dispute for adjudication to this court,—*vide* order No. ID/GG/118-A-71/24533-37, dated 2nd August, 1971, the term of reference being as given under :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Khoobi Ram was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

Usual notices were given to the parties and they have put in their respective written statements. Shri Khoobi Ram has pleaded that he was a permanent workman but the management was displeased with his trade union activities and so has terminated his services without any justification. The management has without filing any regular written statement produced a copy of receipt dated 23rd June, 1971, showing payment of Rs 250 to Shri Khoobi Ram concerned workman in the office of the Labour Officer, Gurgaon, and after filing the said receipt the management has elected not to appear in the present proceedings.

The concerned workman has made his own statement on oath to the effect that his services had been terminated by the management without any notice or charge-sheet and when his personal approach to the Proprietor of the establishment for his reinstatement had proved unsuccessful, he had served the demand notice dated 3rd May, 1971, Ex. W.1 which forms part of the present reference. He has further stated that before the Labour Officer, Gurgaon a sum of Rs 250 had been paid to him by the management towards his wages and over time allowance for the months of March and April, 1971, but this was in no way a final settlement of his claims and he had never given-up his right of reinstatement or re-employment. He has also urged that in spite of his efforts he could not get any other job and his not been gainfully employed anywhere ever-since his services were terminated by the management. Shri Shardha Nand, General Secretary, Gurgaon Engineering Mazdoor Union, Gurgaon, who had given the demand notice leading to the present reference has fully supported the above statement of the workman concerned.

Taking into consideration the facts on record, I see no reason to disbelieve the workman and am quite clear in my mind as to the genuineness of his claim especially when the management has not cared to take part in the proceedings after filing a copy of receipt of Rs 250 to this workman which is not denied by him and which by no stretch of imagination can be held to be a full and final settlement of the dispute covered by the present reference.

I, therefore, hold that the impugned termination of services of Shri Khoobi Ram concerned workman is not justified and in order and he is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of his previous service and full back wages. The award is made accordingly. No order as to costs.

O. P. SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

Dated 23rd November, 1972.

No. 2682, dated 27th November, 1972

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

O. P. SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

The 13th December, 1971

No. 13255-4Lab-72/49955.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Municipal Committee, Sonepat.

BEFORE SHRI O. P. SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,
ROHTAK

Reference No. 205 of 1972

between

SHRI HEM CHANDER AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S MUNICIPAL COMMITTEE,
SONEPAT

Present :

Shri Hem Chander, workman in person.
Shri Des Raj, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/RK/92-B-72/32334-38, dated 22nd August, 1972 of the Governor of Haryana, the following dispute between Municipal Committee, Sonipat and its employee Shri Hem Chander was referred for adjudication to this court, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Whether the termination of services of Shri Hem Chander was justified and in order ?
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

Usual notices were given to the parties and they have appeared. An amicable settlement of the dispute has been brought about. Shri Hem Chander concerned workman has been reinstated and he has actually joined his duty with effect from 4th July, 1972. He voluntarily foregoes his claim for back wages.

In the circumstances, there is now no dispute left between the parties and a no dispute award is made as requested by the parties. No order as to costs.

O. P. SHARMA,

Dated 30th November, 1972.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 2775, dated the 4th December, 1972.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

O. P. SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 13259-4Lab-72/49957.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Universal Refrigeration Industries, Bahadurgarh.

BEFORE SHRI O. P. SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Application No. 16 of 1972 under section 33-X of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

between

THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S UNIVERSAL REFRIGERATION
INDUSTRIES, BAHADURGARH

Present :

Shri Onkar Parshad, for the workmen.
Shri R. C. Sharma and Shri K. Kumar, for the management.

AWARD

The facts relevant for the disposal of this complaint under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, may shortly be stated as under :—

Saryshri Ram Adhar and Bhagat Singh were in the service of M/s Universal Refrigeration Industries, Bahadurgarh, Ram Adhar as a helper and Bhagat Singh as a Turner. The management allegedly terminated the services of Shri Ram Adhar with effect from 27th July, 1972 and Shri Bhagat Singh with effect from 2nd August, 1972. Feeling aggrieved they have brought this joint complaint with the allegation that Industrial Dispute No. 40 of 1972 in respect of demands raised by the workmen of this concern for increase in their wages and fixation of grades and scales of their pay was since pending at the relevant time. The management had passed the impugned orders of the termination of their services in contravention of the provisions of section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, and hence this complaint. With the above allegation in brief both the workers have prayed for a direction to the management to reinstate them with continuity of their service and full back wages.

Notice of the complaint was given to the respondent management which has been contested mainly on the ground that as a matter of fact both the workers had tendered their resignations and received payments in full of

their dues and that being so it was not a case of the management having terminated their services and therefore, there was no question of the contravention of the provisions of section 33 of the Act. The following issue arose for determination :—

“Whether there has been a contravention of the provisions of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 ? If so, what relief the complainant workmen entitled to ?”

Sarvshri Ram Adhar and Bhagat Singh have made their own statements besides examining a co-worker Shri Hira Mani. Their authorised representative Shri Onkar Parshad has also made his statement. Reliance has further been placed upon two complaints earlier sent to the management under postal certificates Ex. W-1, W-2, W-3 and W-4. On behalf of the management Shri K. Kumar, Manager, has come into the witness box and proved certain documents including application, dated 22nd February, 1972 of Shri Bhagat Singh for appointment in a temporary vacancy Ex. M-1, payment voucher (for Rs 190.97) signed by Shri Bhagat Singh Ex. M-2, resignation, dated 2nd August, 1972 of Shri Bhagat Singh Ex. M-3, appointment letter, dated 22nd February, 1972 of Shri Bhagat Singh Ex. M-4, payment voucher (Rs 75), thumb marked by Shri Ram Adhar Ex. M-5, resignation of Shri Ram Adhar Ex. M-6, appointment letter, dated 1st May, 1972 of Shri Ram Adhar Ex. M-7.

The case has been fully argued on both sides and I have given my due consideration to the facts on record. As would be clear from the documents brought on the record by the respondent management, Shri Ram Adhar had put in service only for about three months and Shri Bhagat Singh for about six months. Their resignations are on record and the same have been duly proved from the statement of the Manager Shri K. Kumar who had accepted them. It is further beyond any shadow of doubt that they have received payment of their dues, Shri Bhagat Singh Rs 190.97 against voucher Ex. M-2 and Shri Ram Adhar Rs. 76 against voucher Ex. M-5 which are signed and thumb marked by them respectively. They have also in a way admitted the resignations and receipt of the dues as per the vouchers mentioned above. Their contention, however, is that no payment were actually made to them and these documents were got executed under coercion. The burden was on them to establish this fact by bringing on record cogent and convincing evidence but they have failed to discharge this burden. In the absence of convincing proof of any malafides or unfair labour practice on the part of the management the genuineness of the documents which are signed or thumb marked by the workmen concerned has got to be believed.

In the circumstances, I do not find any contravention of the provisions of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 by the management in discharging the services of the applicants in pursuance of their own resignations. The complaints shall, in the result, stand dismissed. No order as to costs.

O. P. SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Dated the 29th November, 1972.

No. 1304, dated 27th November, 1972.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes, Act, 1947.

Dated the 29th November, 1972.

O. P. SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 13258-4Lab-72/49959.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Vikas Agro Engineering Company (P) Ltd., Bahadurgarh.

BEFORE SHRI O. P. SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Application No. 30 of 1972 under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1972

between

SHRI TULSI RAM, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S VIKAS AGRO
ENGINEERING COMPANY (P) LTD., BAHADURGARH

Present :

Shri Rajinder Singh, Dahiya for the workman.

Shri D. C. Chadha, for the management.

AWARD

The facts relevant for the disposal of this complaint under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, may briefly be stated as under :—

The management of M/s Vikas Agro Engineering (P) Ltd., Bahadurgarh discharged from service its workman Shri Tulsi Ram a Mechanic with effect from 1st November, 1972. Feeling aggrieved he brought this complaint on 4th November, 1972 alledging that the impugned order of his discharge from service had been made by the management during the pendency of Reference No. 49 of 1972 and without obtaining the permission of the Tribunal. He, therefore, prayed for his reinstatement with continuity of previous service and back wages.

Notice of the complaint was given to the respondent management. An amicable settlement has been arrived at. As per the statements of the authorised representatives of the parties Shri Tulsi Ram concerned workman has been taken back in service and the management has further agreed to pay his due wages. The complaint has consequently been withdrawn and shall stand dismissed as such. No order as to costs.

Dated the 29th November, 1972.

O. P. SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 1305, dated the 29th November, 1972

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated the 29th November, 1972.

O. P. SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 13257-4Lab-72/49961.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Atlas Cycle Industries Ltd., Sonepat.

BEFORE SHRI O. P. SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,
ROHTAK

Reference No. 179 of 1970

between

SHRI MADAN LAL AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S ATLAS CYCLE INDUSTRIES LTD.,
SONEPAT

Present :

Shri M. S. Rathi, for the workman.

Shri S. K. Gulati, for the management.

AWARD

The facts material for the disposal of this reference under clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be stated as under :—

The management of M/s Atlas Cycle Industries Ltd., Sonepat dismissed from service its employee Shri Chhotu Ram. Feeling aggrieved he raised a demand for his reinstatement with continuity of previous service and back wages but without any success. This gave rise to an industrial dispute and the Governor of Haryana referred the dispute for adjudication to this Court,—*vide* order No. ID/RK/30-M-70/29831—35, dated 23rd September, 1970, with the following term of reference :—

“Whether the termination of service of Shri Madan Lal Miglani was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

Usual notices were given to the parties and they have put in their respective written statements. The management has contested the claim of the workman on several grounds pleading *inter alia* that the reference is barred under settlement, dated 5th August, 1968 brought about between the management and the workmen under section 12(3) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Copy of the said settlement was placed on record and the management further filed a true copy of the judgement, dated 21st December, 1971 of Hon'ble the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh dismissing the latter's Patent Appeal No. 84 of 1971 filed by another employee Shri S. P. Sikka against the judgement, dated 27th November, 1970 of Hon'ble Mr. Justice S. S. Sandhawalia upholding the above plea of the management in that case. A true copy of another order, dated 21st July, 1972 of Hon'ble High Court dismissing three applications under Article No. 133(1) of the Constitution of India for granting the certificate of fitness for filing the appeal in the Supreme Court against the above decision, dated 21st December, 1971 has also been produced.

I have heard the learned representatives of the parties and considered the facts on record. In view of the judgement, dated 27th November, 1970 of Hon'ble Mr. Justice S. S. Sandhawalia that a workman could not approach the Conciliation Officer and the Conciliation Officer had no jurisdiction to go into the matter before the procedure laid down in the settlement between the management and the workman had been followed, and for that matter, no industrial dispute could be referred for adjudication to the Industrial Labour Court which has been further upheld,—*vide* order, dated 21st December, 1971 dismissing the Letters Patent Appeal No. 84 of 1971, I am quite clear in my mind that the present reference is barred by virtue of the aforesaid settlement and as such the contention raised on behalf of the management should prevail. The learned representative of the workman has not been able to satisfy me to the contrary.

For the reasons, aforesaid, the present reference is held to be bad in law and without jurisdiction. In the circumstances, there shall be no order as to costs.

Dated the 30th November, 1972.

O. P. SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 2774, dated 4th December, 1972.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

O. P. SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 13256-4Lab-72/49963.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Atlas Cycle Industries Ltd., Sonepat.

BEFORE SHRI O.P. SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 54 of 1970
between

SHRI RAM AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S ATLAS CYCLE INDUSTRIES LTD.,
SONEPAT

Present : Shri M.S. Rathi, for the workman.

Shri S.K. Gulati, for the management.

AWARD

The facts material for the disposal of this reference under clause (c) of sub-section (i) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be stated as under—

The management of M/s Atlas Cycle Industries Ltd., Sonepat dismissed from service its employee Shri Chhotu Ram. Feeling aggrieved he raised a demand for his reinstatement with continuity of previous service and back wages but without any success. This gave rise to an industrial dispute and the Governor of Haryana referred the dispute for adjudication to this court,—*vide* order No. ID/RK/30-I-69/23156-60, dated 20th August, 1969, with the following term of reference :

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Chhotu Ram was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?”

Usual notices were given to the parties and they have put in their respective written statements. The management has contested the claim of the workman on several grounds pleading *inter alia* that the reference is barred under settlement dated 5th August, 1968 brought about between the management and the workman under section 12(3) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Copy of the said settlement was placed on record and the management further filed a true copy of the judgement dated 21st December, 1971 of Hon'ble the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh dismissing the Letters Patent Appeal No. 84 of 1971 filed by another employee Shri S. P. Sikka against the judgement dated 27th November, 1970 of Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.S. Sandhawalia upholding the above plea of the management in that case. A true copy of another order dated 21st July, 1972 of Hon'ble the High Court dismissing three applications under Article No. 133 (1) of the Constitution of India for granting the certificate of fitness for filing the appeal in the Supreme Court against the above decision.

I have heard the learned representatives of the parties and considered the facts on record. In view of the judgement dated 27th November, 1970 of Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.S. Sandhawalia that a workman could not approach the Conciliation Officer and the Conciliation Officer had no jurisdiction to go into the matter before the procedure laid down in the settlement between the management and the workman had been followed, and for that matter, no industrial dispute could be referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court which has been further upheld *vide* order dated 21st December, 1971 dismissing the Letters Patent Appeal No. 84 of 1971, I am quite clear in my mind that the present reference is barred by virtue of the aforesaid settlement and as such the contention raised on behalf of the management should prevail. The learned representative of the workman has not been able to satisfy me to the contrary.

For the reasons aforesaid, the present reference is held to be bad in law and without jurisdiction. In the circumstances, there shall be no order as to costs.

Dated 30th November, 1972.

O.P. SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 2773, dated 4th December, 1972

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

O.P. SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

S.N. BHANOT,

Commissioner for Labour and Employment, and
Secretary to Government, Haryana.

HARYANA PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT, BUILDINGS AND ROADS BRANCH

The 24th November, 1972

No. 28-HA-63H/592.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is satisfied that land specified below is needed by the Government, at public expense for a public purpose, namely, for the construction of Chikanwas Mahalsara road in Hissar District. It is hereby declared that the land described in the specification below is required for the aforesaid purpose.

This declaration is made under the provisions of section 6 of Land Acquisition Act, 1894, to all whom it may concern and under the provisions of section 7 of the said Act, the Land Acquisition Collector, Haryana, P.W.D., B. & R. Branch, Ambala Cantt. or any other special Collector authorised by the Colonization Officer-cum-Special Land Acquisition Collector, Haryana is hereby directed to take orders for the acquisition of the said land.

Plans of the land may be inspected in the offices of the Land Acquisition Collector, Haryana, P.W.D., B. & R. Branch, Ambala Cantt. and Executive Engineer, Construction/Provincial Division, Hissar.

SPECIFICATION

Name of District	Name of Tehsil	Name of Village	Area in Acres	Details of Khasra Nos.
Hissar	.. Hissar	.. V. Chikanwas/144	7.26	57
				21/1
				56
				21 to 25
				55
				21 to 25
				53
				21 to 25
				54
				21 to 25
				52
				22, 23, 24, 25
				71
				3, 4, 5
				70
				1 to 5

District	Tehsil	Locality	Area in Acres	Khasra Nos.
Hissar	Hissar	Chiknwas—144— concl'd	7.26— concl'd	69 1 to 5 68 1 to 5 67 2 to 5, 1/2, 1/1 163, 133
Do	Do	Jagan	12.35	137, 148, 119, 117, 145, 227, 226, 134, 142, 126, 227, 129, 240, 130, 43 22, 23, 24, 25 51 21, 22 52 1/2, 2/1, 2/2, 1/1 50 21 to 25 49 21 to 25 48 21 to 25 47 21 to 25 46 21, 22/1, 22/2, 23, 24, 25 53 1—5 54 1—5 55 1 to 5 56 1 to 5 57 5, 4/2, 4/1, 3 42 43
Do	Do	Asewan	16.57	151, 152, 206, 208, 200, 109, 1 333, 334, 335, 336, 315, 316, 170, 199, 100, 202, 201, 190, 159, 150, 157, 56 2, 1, 10/1 54 24, 25/1, 25/2 55 5, 6/1, 6/2, 7, 13/1, 13/2, 14, 12, 14, 19, 18, 20, 21 65 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10 91 6/1, 6/2, 13, 15, 18, 14/1, 14/2, 19/1, 19/2 90 1, 2/1, 2/2, 3, 9, 10 74 1, 2 72 16/1, 16/2, 17, 23, 24, 25 73 4, 5/1, 5/2, 6 73 6, 7, 8, 13, 12/1, 12/2, 11, 20

District	Tehsil	Locality	Area in Acres	Khasra Nos.
Hissar	Hissar	Asewan - concld	16.57 concld	74
				1/1, 1/2
				66
				14, 17, 15/1, 15/2, 18/1, 18/2, 22/1, 22/2, 21, 23
Do	..	Do	9.80	161, 162, 163, 65
				20, 21
				66
				1
				64
				21, 22, 23
				64
		Mehalsara	3.41	24/1, 24/2, 25/1, 2/2, 5 60
				5, 4, 3, 2, 1 63
				21 to 25
				67
				1 to 5 57
				21 to 25 58
				21 to 25 59
				21 to 25 60
				21 to 25 61
				21 to 25 62
				21 to 25 67
				1 to 5 68
				1 to 5 69
				1 to 5 70
				1 to 5 71
				1 to 5 72
				1 to 5 73
				21, 20, 11, 10, 1, 74
				25, 16, 15, 6, 5
			81	82
				1, 5
Total	..	94.39		

M.G. UPPAL,

Superintending Engineer,
Hissar Circle, P.W.D., B. & R. Branch,
Hissar.